DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 604 HE 000 927

By-Brooks, James E.; And Others

The Role of the Administration and the Governing Board.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Nov 68
Note-10p.; Paper presented at the 8th Annual Meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., November 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.60
Descriptors-*Administrator Role, *Educational Objectives, Faculty, *Governing Boards, Higher Education, *Institutional Administration, *Leadership Responsibility, Student Participation

The first of these 4 statements suggests that faculty and student involvement in institutional governance is a learning experience which, to be effective, needs the leadership of the administration. This leadership is lacking because of administrators' concern with and protection of their authority and their attitudes, among other things. The major administrative role, according to the second statement, is the determination of institutional goals. Another role should be to ensure the involvement of faculty, student, trustee, and administrative staff in the governing structure, with areas of authority and responsibility properly delineated. Four other administrative roles are proposed for keeping the university within sight of its goals. The chairman of a governing board presents some of his experiences in the third statement. Governing board members often feel that they lack sufficient information about the issues on which they make policy, especially when a multi-institutional system is involved. Administrators and trustees, when under pressure by the public and the legislatures, need to select a meaningful challenge, accommodate to it, and resist the rest with tact, understanding, and firmness. The fourth statement suggests that the state coordinating board, with the governing boards and the administrations of institutions, should develop statewide plans, and share the responsibilities for meeting goals, problems, and challenges in higher education. (WM)

ED029604

# THE ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE GOVERNING BOARD

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

*JAMES E. BROOKS*
*RICHARD R. BOND*
*RICHARD J. NELSON*
*PRINCE B. WOODARD*

American Association of State Colleges
And Universities, Washington, D.C.

HE 000 927

## JAMES E. BROOKS

The institutions that will be the most successful in the coming years will observe these two principles:

Regardless of all of the dialogue about shared authority, the primary responsibilities for governance and leadership rests with the trustees and the administration. When an institution fails, these two groups should be the first to be called on the carpet.

Before all groups on a college campus can enjoy satisfying and effective participation, the administration and the board of trustees must be committed to such participation and willing to work hard to make it successful.

I submit to you that the record to date suggests that we have relatively little interest in the leadership aspect. We know more about higher education than anyone else, but it is Max Rafferty who interprets it to our society. It is somewhat ironical that we come here to talk to each other about why the public and the students are losing faith in higher education. We seem to agree to broad scale involvement of faculty and students, but we think they are responsible to make it work, and, indeed, at times it seems we are secretly pleased when it fails. Such involvement is a learning experience for both faculty and students. They cannot be effective, they cannot make good decisions unless they are provided leadership and full information which, in most cases, only the administration can provide. It is no wonder that students refuse to serve on committees or are ineffective.

Apparently we have a number of hang-ups that prevent us from assuming leadership. I can think of six examples.

First, we are overly concerned with authority. This is shown by our professional associations, and I include here the Association of Governing Boards, which has been fretting for years over the erosion of our authority. The statement in the theme for this meeting, "Whose In Charge Here?" clearly identifies the underlying concern of this meeting. Authority is important to all of us, but it is no substitute for leadership.

Second, I would guess that compiling the business items in the Board minutes of each institution represented here for the last three years would result in long lists of administrative matters, but very few policy decisions. We trustees and presidents are great at handling administrative detail, but most hesitant to offer strong leadership at a time when the students are asking us to consider the need for restructuring our colleges and our society.

Third, with our society making great demands on higher education, most of us still hesitate to cooperate by meeting needs on an inter-institutional basis unless there is something in it for us. We spend time protecting our kingdoms, much as we protect our legal authority on our individual campuses.

Fourth, we either over-react to criticism or don't react at all. I believe good teachers, for example, are better teachers when they do some research, but unless we define and explain this before students, the modest research programs that most of us have going on our campuses will be under heavy fire from students who simply don't understand the situation.

Fifth, I believe the total administrative structure within most colleges creates as many problems as it solves. People are divided not only into departments but into major groupings, and in such diverse ways that I wouldn't be surprised if 50 per cent of their time is spent trying to communicate and coordinate with each other. It is no wonder these people have no time to talk to students. I don't know the answer to this problem, but I believe that some creative college somewhere will devise an organization which facilitates communications without memoranda, and substitutes redistribution of authority, easy discussion of mutually perceived problems, and day-to-day involvement of all concerned groups on campus in ways that promote confidence and understanding.

Perhaps at that time, leadership can be easily related to the issues.

Sixth, and last, most presidents of colleges in our Association are unable to provide the leadership that is demanded because they don't have sufficient administrative help to take care of internal coordination, mail, and all the tasks that should be assigned to others. Until this is corrected, we can't expect campus leadership to come from college presidents.

These are my reflections from my limited background in a medium-sized state college. They reflect, I am sure, my own shortcomings and my deep concern as an administrator.

## RICHARD R. BOND

I will speak largely to the administrative role in faculty governance as seen by the academic arm of an institution which, like most of yours, is changing rapidly and growing at an incredible rate. Not only are these changes calling for administrative accommodation on the campus, with extra layers of deans between the president and me on the one hand and the faculty on the other, but externally in Illinois they are calling for a realignment of institutions with a redefinition of mission. Northern Illinois University and Illinois State University have been singled out to expand rapidly our graduate programs to the doctoral level and our upper undergraduate programs to accommodate increasing numbers of junior college graduates.

Since many of you face similar problems, I will move back one step in exploring the role of the administration and insist that its first role is to lead the university community to address itself to the question of what the university is about.

It is clear that many so-called emerging institutions desire to become, to quote T. R. McConnell, "pale reflections" of the major universities with the same proliferation of specialties and the same emphasis upon research. In these institutions, it can be fairly stated, the interests

of the faculty are pitted squarely against those of the students and little sympathetic concern is shown for undergraduates. The allegiance of such faculty to their disciplines has become a trite story.

But let me suggest that we as administrators are not without blame. For just as faculty members may see the development of their specializations as a means to self-enhancement in their professional aspirations, how many of us see our administrative careers brightened by the development of our institutions in size or scope—and push in that direction without regard to the students whom we profess to serve?

A major administrative role being, then, a determination of institutional goals, it seems to me, secondly, that a concomitant administrative role is to insure that there is adequate administrative, faculty, student, and trustee input into the process so that the goals can be seen as institutional goals, and the long-range academic plan which must emerge from these goals becomes truly an institutional plan.

The time for developing such a plan and for redefining a university's mission seems to me also to be an appropriate time to redefine the lines of authority and responsibility in the university. Perhaps it is characteristic that such an activity can occur most readily in a new or radically changing institution—certainly it is easier there. Our Board of Regents, common both to Northern Illinois and us, is, with extensive faculty and student participation, re-examining its governing document. This will cover Board policy and define in general terms the role of the Board, the faculty, and the students. It will outline the rights, responsibilities, and protections for each segment. Each campus then will draft its specific constitution. On our campus, a joint faculty-student committee, which is in close liaison with the president and me, is re-examining our governing structure. Under consideration is a broad representative University Council of diverse membership under which will be subsumed our student senate, faculty senate, and even, mind you, a non-academic senate, with functions and structures of each carefully delineated.

The inclusion of a non-academic staff as an integral part of the governing structure—with appropriate areas of authority and responsibility carefully delineated—may be hotly debated both on our campus and elsewhere. The question of the inclusion of students, however, seems to me to be beyond question. Whether the students, on the basis of public higher education having been increasingly recognized by the courts as a constitutional right, have a <u>right</u> to such a role or whether, as Charles Frankel argues in a recent article, it is merely that it is good educational and administrative practice to include them, I have heard no denial here that students have a genuine, serious, and vital role to play in those aspects of university activity, including curriculum, which directly affect them. We hope, cooperatively, to delineate such areas and to formalize areas of responsibility and consultation.

The concept of shared authority between faculty and administration is one of long standing on our campus, with the current University Council consisting of faculty and administrative representation at a ratio of about four to one, with budget, salary, promotion and tenure, curriculum, and other key committees elected by the representative faculty Council. In such an arrangement, the administrative role is, and will continue to

be, one of persuasion, deliberation, and yes, compromise. Council action also has included student membership on all university curriculum bodies and has encouraged departmental and collegiate student advisory bodies. It has been our experience that some departments are reluctant to institute such groups, but the main persuasion has been from concerned faculty on the University Council.

We need to examine our election process, however, to see that our faculty senate is truly representative of the diverse elements of the faculty – discipline, age, tenure, viewpoint – and that the student senate, which is the major appointive body for student representation, is truly representative of the students. I suspect we share the problem of many campuses that some of the faculty do not feel the Council represents new faculty adequately, and many students feel that the student senate only inadequately represents the student body.

Regardless of the structure of the governing body, I have not, nor will I, refer to specific items such as curriculum or admissions and similar items, which seem to me to be normal functions of the faculty body and which may also have student input. The point is that the precise functions should be agreed upon in the governing documents for any institution. Suffice it to say that there is extreme need to reserve policy decisions for the governing structures and not waste valuable faculty time on the administration of those policies for which the administration is responsible.

While I am discussing the consideration of structure as an administrative role, may I be presumptuous enough to make a suggestion regarding the trustees. In addition to communicating devices, to which I will allude later, I would take one step beyond Mr. Corson, who asked, you recall, that there be persons on the Board who know something about education. It seems to me that it would also be worthwhile considering a greater range of both age and economic condition on our boards.

I have discussed the need for the administration to see that university goals are set and to insure that there is adequate representative structure to make the goals and policies truly university goals. I would add a third administrative role – that of keeping the university on the track. Four specific administrative roles are essential.

- The president or his administrative representative must keep the goals and their interpretation constantly before the university community in meetings, speeches, etc.
- The president or his administrative representative must provide the initiative for innovation and revision of goals. As the 1966 AAUP statement indicates, "As the chief planning officer of an institution, the president has a special obligation to innovate and initiate. The degree to which a president can envision new horizons for his institution, and can persuade others to see them and work toward them, will often constitute the chief measure of his administration."

As our institutions grow larger, much of this will be done through setting sights and through delegation to his administrative officers – vice presidents, deans and department heads. Since reasonable commonality of goals is essential, both the president and his chief academic officers must have a role with the faculty in the selection of deans and department heads. McGeorge Bundy stated it delightfully: "It is an amiable

illusion that the community of scholars is immune to narrowness or error in the co-option of its peers, and one of the president's most important obligations to his faculty is to try to save it from its tendencies toward folly."

• The president and his entire staff must place major emphasis upon human relations throughout his entire organization. As a small, but extremely significant example, the action of a secretary in a huff or a minor administrative official in a hurry can undo in seconds a student relationship cultivated by the dean of students for months. I would strongly urge the assiduous development of a university tone in this regard.

• Finally, in order to keep the university on the track, the administration must develop major attention to the maintenance of communications at all levels, both up and down and laterally across departmental lines.

I have frequently been appalled at the trustees' mistrust of any student or any faculty – often confusing those with legitimate dissent or criticism with those whose purpose is disruption. Similar mistrust occurs in the other direction. The faculty-student alignment against administration on many campuses is rapidly becoming a student-administration alignment against faculty. The leadership in understanding and developing means of bridging these gaps rests with the administration, but probably will be effected most easily by the development of both the formalized structures, which I have described, and the careful planning of regular and frequent face-to-face contacts which are so necessary in any human enterprise. Certainly each of us is anxious that the human enterprise in which we are engaged also be a humane enterprise.

## RICHARD J. NELSON

As a chairman of a governing Board for six institutions, it occurs to me that some of my experiences were relatively unique. In the first place, I believe boards governing several institutions, particularly as many as four or more, have special problems. I suspect that even with the most competent and best-intentioned president of a single campus institution, many board members are frequently uncomfortable because they feel that they do not have as much information as they would like with respect to issues on which they make policy.

This becomes infinitely more difficult with a complex multi-institutional system. First, there is a limit to the amount of information a board member can absorb. Second, with all due respect to presidents, from time to time one has the feeling that some of the "old pros" provide their boards with just enough information to support the decisions they want and no more. I do not suggest that this situation is unique to the administration of higher education, for it is obviously a form of gamesmanship that is played in all areas of social management.

The institutions under our board are heterogeneous in nature. Several in smaller communities typify the evolution of the old normal school into a college and then a university. The two in Chicago are evolving teacher training institutions with students of modest backgrounds, and until recently, were inadequately supported by the city which ran them. These last two institutions appear to have more militants in the student body than the small community institutions. Nevertheless, when one contemplates what has been happening at Berkeley and at Morningside Heights, the activities in our system seem almost tolerable although I am not sure that the presidents would agree with me.

A more difficult area is that of the faculty. Here we have perhaps a classic case of rising expectations, complicated by the fact that the explosion of higher education after World War II has inevitably diluted the quality of preparation of those who aspire to teach in institutions of higher education. This is further complicated by the impersonality of large institutions and particularly large multi-institutional systems.

Faculty who may have a sincere, but limited commitment to the profession of teaching, tend to conform to the stereotypes of the general population. They not only do not have the skills and abilities to make them mobile and attractive to the better institutions, but they have an understandable reluctance to dislocate themselves and their families. An alternate is for them to dig in, join in a collective effort to improve economic status, and to resist efforts to have administrators discriminate among them in terms of ability and contribution.

The other side of this coin, it seems to me, regrettably involves limitation of individual freedom and compromise of the basic concept of the search for truth. I see this issue as basically one of self-perception on the part of the faculty member. It is he who determines whether he is a free spirit committed to truth and freedom or whether he will cast himself in a role comparable to that of the industrial worker and seek protection by collective effort.

I suspect that the resolution of this issue is one of the most fundamental concerning administrators and trustee. Only by their defense of freedom, and by their success in obtaining adequate financial support, can they help avoid the collectivization of faculty.

This last point brings me to the issue of pressures brought upon administrators and governing boards by the public and the legislatures.

It is a continuing source of distress that the general public has so little understanding of the function of the university. More annoying and distressing is the fact that so many university graduates share this lack of understanding. I believe this to be one of the strongest indictments of higher education in America. When are we going to be able to persuade alumni to relate to their institutions other than through football? Never, I assure you, if the first objective of every emerging university is to develop a good football team. It is not unlike the emerging nations that want a national airline and a steel mill regardless of whether they fit into any rational order of priorities. At least an airline or steel mill would seem to have some ultimate relevance for an emerging nation.

Unfortunately, some of the more serious cases of lack of understanding with reference to higher education exist within the legislatures. This is, in a sense, a more manageable problem than trying to educate

the general public. The number of people involved is relatively small, and presidents and trustees have, or can make, the opportunity to have personal contact with legislators.

One of the most important things that happens to a new president of a state school is the evolution of his relationship with the legislature. If a legislature finds that it can push a president around, it will. On the other hand, if a qualified, competent administrator will take well thought-out positions, even if they are controversial, and defend them ably and with integrity, the legislature will learn to respect him and treat him accordingly.

To any amongst you who have tried this latter path and found it does not work, I extend my condolences and apologies.

The institution of higher education in America is being tried as never before and yet there is so much good about the challenge that I believe the worst thing that can happen would be to deteriorate into the position of rejecting all challenge out of hand. The delicate and sensitive role of administrators and trustees these days is to sort out the meaningful challenge and accommodate to it, and to resist and deny the rest with tact, understanding, and firmness where necessary.

## PRINCE B. WOODARD

I speak on the relationship of the state coordinating board with the governing board and the administration of an institution for two reasons. First, this was the relationship on which I was asked to focus in this panel; secondly, this is the precise type of relationship I have been concerned with over the past five years in my capacity as Executive Director of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, which is Virginia's coordinating board for the state system of higher education.

State coordinating boards – boards responsible for statewide planning, promotion and coordination of all state supported higher education – exist today in approximately two-thirds of our states and go under a variety of titles such as State Council of Higher Education, State Board of Higher Education, Coordinating Board, State Advisory Council on Higher Education, and many others.

Title notwithstanding, the state coordinating board is a board primarily engaged in statewide, long-range planning of all elements of post-high school state-controlled education. It has statutory responsibility for the development and maintenance of a coordinated system of higher education and recommends state policy on all aspects of public higher education. It does not control or set internal policy for any individual institution. Yet, in my opinion, there must be a joint involvement and sharing of interest and purpose among the state coordinating board, the college administration and the governing board of an institution.

My knowledge of statewide higher education developments in a number of states with coordinating boards and my experiences as a daily participant in this tri-party relationship—college administration, institutional governing board and state coordinating board—convinces me that three parties can function in effective concert to the benefit of both the individual institutions and the state system of higher education.

What then are some principles and practices which are most promising in fostering a sound relationship between the governing board and administration of an institution and the statewide coordinating board?

A basic principle which must be accepted by the governing board and administration of an institution and by the statewide coordinating board as well, may be stated somewhat like this: In order for a state to provide adequate higher educational opportunities for its citizenry, it must plan, project and support a comprehensive and coordinated system of higher education which guarantees maximum institutional autonomy and diversity within a framework of broad statewide policies.

Now, what in specific terms is the meaning of this generalization?

It means that both the administration and the institutional governing board must recognize that their college or university cannot be all things to all people. It means that the institutional administration and governing board must give searching thought to a determination of the proper role their institution can and should play within the state system, and then focus every effort toward having their institution perform this role with distinction. It also means that the institutional governing board and administration must be able to articulate effectively the mission and role of their institution and, through institutional analyses and evaluation, be cognizant of both the strengths and the weaknesses of the performance level of their institution.

On the part of the state coordinating board, the basic principle requires this board to be keenly perceptive of the range of higher educational opportunities which must be provided if the state is to fulfill its educational responsibilities.

It means that the state coordinating board must function as a facilitator and as a promotional agency, to provide the right educational programs in the right places at the right time. It means that the state coordinating board must be concerned—in a constructive, positive manner—with a wide spectrum of policies, issues and questions whose resolution must be achieved in a statewide context, rather than with an individual institution.

Now to comment on several procedures which are consistent with the basic principle I have outlined.

First, the statewide coordinating board must conduct its work in accordance with a clearly stated set of operating procedures.

Second, in all of its long-range planning activities the state coordinating board should rely heavily upon the advice, guidance and counsel of institutional personnel. One effective way of accomplishing this is through the establishment of a network of advisory committees. The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia has a network of advisory committees that includes more than 170 institutional personnel from both public and private colleges. These committees are charged by the State Council to formulate policy recommendations on all fundamental aspects of higher education for the Council's consideration.

Third, I wish to stress the necessity for broad dissemination of the coordinating boards' policies and recommendations to the citizenry at large and, in particular, to institutional personnel and the governing boards of all the colleges and universities. Of equal importance is the companion responsibility of the administration of each institution to insure that its board of control understands the rationale behind the coordinating board policies and recognizes that the institution, through its committee representative, participated in the policy development process.

It is the responsibility of the coordinating board to seek the advice and expertise of institutional personnel in developing statewide policies. It is also the obligation of the administration and governing board of the institution to provide the services of outstanding personnel, both administrative and faculty, as participants in the advisory committee work.

Currently, the State Council has, among others, advisory committees on instructional programs, development of libraries and statewide library systems, the establishment of statewide extension and public service offerings, and the improvement of higher educational financing. We are convinced that through the deliberation of these and other committees wise state policy is being developed.

Fourth, when coordinating board policies reflect the recommendations of its advisory committee, there should be a commitment on the part of both the institution and administration and the board of control of the institution to support and abide by such policies.

I am convinced that it is possible for these three partners – institutional governing board, institutional administration, and state coordinating board – to concur on a set of statewide goals for higher education, and to develop a state plan for achieving these higher educational goals which will identify the role of each institution, and specify priorities for the development of higher education within the state.

Shared responsibility among the administration and governing board of the individual college and the state coordinating board for higher education will prove that the higher educational problems and challenges of tomorrow are not greater than the combined talents of these three partners.